

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION**

**Official Records\***



FIRST COMMITTEE  
29th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 5 November 1979  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)  
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Sidik (Indonesia)  
Mrs. Gordah (Tunisia)  
Mr. El-Choufi (Syrian Arab Republic)  
Mr. Ladipo (Benin)  
Mr. Chan Youran (Democratic Kampuchea)  
Mr. Rebelo de Andrade (Portugal)

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.1/34/PV.29  
6 November 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 to 45, 120 and 121 (continued)

#### GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. SIDIK (Indonesia): During the general debate that has been going on for about two weeks in this Committee, many delegations have reaffirmed in their statements the principles which we laid down in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

The present session of this Committee will for the first time examine and assess to what extent the decisions and recommendations of the special session have been implemented and, of course, what further actions should be taken to accelerate the process of their implementation.

The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament made a significant contribution in conceptualizing the problems of disarmament and in charting the direction of their solution. Among the positive aspects, we should mention the revitalization of the Disarmament Commission, the creation of a new and more democratic machinery for negotiations, the Committee on Disarmament, and the establishment of numerous bodies charged with examining specific issues. Equally important is the recognition accorded to the primary responsibility of the nuclear Powers to initiate the process of disarmament, and the legitimate interest of all States in participating on an equal footing in disarmament efforts.

(Mr. Sidik, Indonesia)

More than a year has passed since the General Assembly at the special session defined the priority tasks and a strategy for the implementation of the Programme of Action, but the results of the process of the implementation of its decisions and recommendations have been meagre. We are still witnessing the continuation of the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, which poses a threat to mankind's survival.

A comprehensive test-ban agreement, although pledged in the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty, has not yet materialized. Negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons have not yielded the desired results. The question of strengthening the non-proliferation régime has continued to challenge us. We are confronted with the terrifying prospect of a new generation of weapons of mass destruction that might generate a new and even more dangerous course in the arms race. These developments underline the lack of progress in disarmament efforts and require the serious determination of all of us to translate those decisions into practical terms.

There is no doubt that an important development this year was the signing of the SALT II agreement by the United States and the Soviet Union which has been hailed by the international community as a positive contribution to the avoidance of a nuclear war. We are aware that, by itself, the present agreement is inadequate from the point of view of real disarmament. It is our earnest hope that SALT II will soon enter into force and pave the way for further agreements, in particular in the field of nuclear disarmament.

The Committee on Disarmament, the establishment of which was one of the major decisions of the special session, held its first session this year in Geneva. The representative of Mexico, Mr. Garcia Robles, has in his usual eloquent way dealt at length with the work of the Committee, expressing views with which, generally speaking, my delegation fully associates itself.

Disappointment has been aired by a number of delegations regarding the fact that the achievements of the Committee on Disarmament at its spring and summer sessions this year have fallen short of expectations. While to a certain extent this disappointment is not groundless, we should at the same time bear in mind that the Committee has finally been able to adopt a set of rules on which to base its future proceedings. In addition, it has been able to identify the agreed range of

(Mr. Sidik, Indonesia)

its responsibilities. With so much time devoted to procedural and organizational issues, unfortunately not much time was left for in-depth negotiations on pressing matters.

The effectiveness of the Committee on Disarmament as a multilateral negotiating body will be much enhanced by the participation of all nuclear Powers in its work. In this connexion we note the statement made by the representative of the People's Republic of China that it intends to participate in the work of the Committee next year.

Against the background of the continuing threat posed by nuclear-weapons tests for the future of mankind, the question of a comprehensive test ban remains an issue of major importance. The three negotiating Powers - the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union - involved in a series of negotiations among themselves recently reported to the Committee on the status of those negotiations. The report, however, was short and superficial in nature. What the Committee needs, I believe, is a full report highlighting agreements reached and difficulties encountered. With such a report the Committee would be able to play the role required of it by the special session in the negotiating process. The willingness of the three Powers to initiate negotiations in the Committee would be a step forward towards the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. However, such willingness remains lacking. In our opinion, the attitude of these three Powers is contrary to the spirit of the partial test-ban Treaty, which gives the parties to that Treaty an equal share in the rights and obligations in the search for agreement on a comprehensive test ban.

One of the main difficulties encountered in reaching a test-ban agreement is that of its verification, a system for which should be established efficiently and effectively under strict international control. The on-going work done by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Considering International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events is, judging from its report on its seventh session, very useful, and my delegation fully supports the continuation of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Group. In this respect, my delegation would like to extend its appreciation to the Netherlands and Sweden for their invaluable contributions in submitting to the Committee on Disarmament proposals that could lead to the possibility of better detection and pinpointing of potential violations.

(Mr. Sidik, Indonesia)

A welcome development arising out of the discussion on chemical weapons was the submission to the Committee by the two negotiating Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, of an agreed joint proposal on the major elements of a treaty banning chemical weapons. It is our belief that this joint proposal can form the basis for negotiations by the Committee, taking into account also the proposal submitted by other members of the Committee. The consideration of this question would be facilitated by the establishment of an ad hoc working group. My delegation is fully aware that the problem of verification is a complicated one and might hamper the achievement of an international agreement. My delegation takes note of the very serious efforts made by several countries to overcome the sticky problem of verification. In this connexion, we are grateful to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the United Kingdom for their conducting workshops early this year, since that has helped countries like Indonesia to appreciate the practical problems and possibilities of verification. We strongly believe that verification is not an insurmountable problem.

On the question of verification as a whole, another possible system would be that provided by the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency, as proposed by France. In his statement made on 29 October last, the representative of France, Mr. de la Gorce, commented on the report of the group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General, and supported the proposal for further in-depth study and the preparation of a comprehensive report. If such a system could be created - of course, with the active collaboration of all States Members, in particular the two super-Powers - it would play a vital role in the verification of many disarmament agreements, either as an independent entity or in co-operation with other international agencies for disarmament.

In his statement before the General Assembly, my Foreign Minister, Mr. Kusumaatmadja, spoke of the need for security guarantees for the non-nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Sidik, Indonesia)

He said: "Efforts in this regard did not succeed owing to disagreement among the nuclear-weapon States on providing such a guarantee " (A/34/PV.10, p.66). It may be recalled that the nuclear Powers have made unilateral declarations on the non-use of nuclear weapons as a means of strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. However, we believe that to be effective and credible, such unilateral declarations should be transformed into a legally binding agreement.

The constant appeal by the non-nuclear-weapon States in this regard has not received any positive response. The ultimate assurance, of course, as also stated by my Foreign Minister, is the total prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances, and the destruction of such weapons. Because of its importance to the non-nuclear-weapon States, this issue merits priority consideration.

The revitalized Disarmament Commission, which met last May, has proved to provide a useful forum for all Member States. Its recommendation as contained in its report accords with the priorities set at the special session. My delegation wishes to point out, however, that some elements which my delegation regards as important have not been included, owing to lack of agreement.

The rapid advances in military technology have focused attention on the inhuman and indiscriminate effects of the use of these weapons. The concern of the international community as regards the prohibition or restriction of the use of certain conventional weapons had been voiced as far back as the late 1960s, when action on it was initiated from both within and outside the United Nations. In the most recent United Nations Conference on prohibitions or restrictions of use of inhumane conventional weapons, convened in Geneva in September 1979 under the efficient and effective leadership of Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria, no conclusive agreement was arrived at, although we note that some progress was made. In some areas only a few differences remain while in some other areas difficult negotiations still have to be undertaken. My delegation hopes that the second session of the Conference, which it is proposed should be held next year, will be able to bridge the existing divergent positions and conclude its work successfully.

(Mr. Sidik, Indonesia)

As our country borders the Indian Ocean, my Government is firmly committed to the implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. My delegation feels encouraged by the recommendation of the recent Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean that a conference on the Indian Ocean be convened. As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, my delegation fully supports the holding of the conference in 1981 in Colombo. It is our hope that the permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users will participate actively in the preparation as well as the work of the conference itself, in order to facilitate the attainment of the objectives of the Declaration.

At this juncture, it might be appropriate for my delegation to refer to the contribution made by the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), to which Indonesia belongs, to the promotion of international peace and security in our region. Indonesia and the countries in the region believe that the success of their respective national development plans depends on the existence of security, peace and stability in the area. To this end the States members of ASEAN have undertaken since 1971 efforts to secure international recognition of and respect for South-East Asia as a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. The declaration of the zone of peace was followed in 1976 by the Declaration of ASEAN Concord, and the Treaty of Amity and Co-operation, all of which seek to strengthen close co-operation among its member States. This undertaking to establish a zone of peace in South-East Asia was noted at the special session and referred to in paragraph 64 (a) of the Final Document.

Finally, my delegation believes that any meaningful effort by the international community towards disarmament will be vain if its attitude is characterized by a lack of mutual trust and confidence. Living in an interdependent world, in which peace and security are inseparable, we can only work for the preservation of peace and stability for ourselves and for future generations in a climate of mutual trust and mutual respect.

Mrs. GORDAH (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, the Tunisian delegation has no doubt that under your guidance the work of our Committee will be successful. I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate the great interest accorded by my country to the consideration of such a crucial item as disarmament, which was also the subject of attention by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries. The Conference reaffirmed the attachment of the Non-Aligned Movement to the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and stressed the central role of the General Assembly in this area.

The Committee is charged exclusively with the consideration of the problems of disarmament, security and allied questions, and this shows, if there is any need of further proof, the great priority which the international community extends unanimously to questions which to a large extent and decisively determine the conditions of life of men and the state of international relations.

Ever since the question was first submitted to study everything possible has been said over and over again in a thousand and one ways, with talent, competence and great conviction. Unfortunately, although everything has been said, and important decisions and resolutions have been adopted very little has been done and a great deal remains to be done as the First Disarmament Decade draws to its close. The work of our organization in certain fields sometimes gives the impression, rightly or wrongly, that it is coming to resemble ever more closely a mere rhetorical exercise. Some might be tempted to give way to a feeling of weariness and, even worse, of scepticism, were it not that they were armed in advance with a genuine and constantly renewed faith in the United Nations and its necessary and indispensable role, and were the stake not so important for the survival of mankind.

The facts today certainly do not encourage optimism. The facts are very far from promoting and helping to bring about disarmament, the successive stages of which should, in our view, make it possible to strengthen détente, then guarantee international security and finally, as an ultimate goal, promote the advent of a world of peace in which the principles of equality and justice will prevail.



(Mrs. Gordah, Tunisia)

In so many places in the world there is tension, instability and insecurity. International relations have been exacerbated by ideological, political and economic antagonisms. Interventions in the internal affairs of States, pressure and threats are common practices today. Along with this - and here, cause and effect are inextricably linked - the arms race knows no respite. The stockpiles of ever more sophisticated and hence more destructive weapons are piling up in the military arsenals, which are no longer the exclusive preserve of the major Powers. The dizzying increase in military expenditures - and the figures quoted now amount to \$45 billion a year for the manufacture of weapons and for weapons research and development - and the intensive and uninterrupted mobilization of human and material potential constitutes a reality which exceeds all bounds.

Mention has also been made of an indication given by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) to the effect that the growing expenditure on armaments in the third world is higher than the sum devoted to development assistance.

This shows that most of the third-world countries have been forced, in spite of their repugnance, to make sacrifices to the detriment of their development in order to ensure their national security at a time when the recrudescence of acts of aggression has created a climate of insecurity.

In consequence, we have to maintain the necessary momentum started by the special session and to translate its recommendations into reality.

The Final Document of the special session is, in our view, something of extreme importance. The decisions and recommendations contained therein should be considered as the best possible point of reference in guiding and directing the efforts of the international community in the field of disarmament.

(Mrs. Gordah, Tunisia)

That is why the balance established in the principles worked out in the course of preparing that text can only be preserved if it is maintained within its original framework.

The document derives its strength from the fact that it was negotiated and adopted on the basis of consensus.

The record of the past year, while not exactly negative, is hardly encouraging. The policy of the great Powers, based on the balance of power and mutual deterrence, is tending to maintain itself as the foundation of international relations. Now the success of our efforts depends in large part on the measures which those Powers adopt to take account of the views and aspirations of all the other States.

Priority has been accorded to nuclear disarmament and to measures which could be taken in that field without prejudice to other urgent matters. However concern for the right to security should in no way be allowed to justify the maintenance of monstrous nuclear arsenals, still less the vertical or horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. We must reaffirm the primary responsibility of the nuclear Powers, and particularly the two major nuclear Powers.

In that regard, my Government was gratified at the conclusion of the SALT II agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States as a stage on the way towards more effective disarmament measures, particularly towards the total cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the reduction of existing arsenals to the point of their total elimination.

Concerning the halting of the nuclear arms race, the proposal made to the Committee on Disarmament by the socialist countries and contained in document CD/4 with regard to negotiations on halting the manufacture of all types of nuclear weapons and on the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons to the point of total elimination is something which deserves our attention.

We are on the very eve of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and it is regrettable that at this stage, in spite of the provisions contained in the preamble of the Treaty and the urgent appeals of the international community, as reflected in a large number of resolutions, the major nuclear

(Mrs. Gordah, Tunisia)

Powers parties to the tripartite negotiations on the total prohibition of nuclear tests have not found it possible to present to the Committee on Disarmament a substantial report delineating genuine progress in their negotiations.

We must lay further stress on the importance and urgency of concluding this Treaty in order to resolve the problem of nuclear proliferation. What is at stake here is not only the credibility of the nuclear Powers but also that of the Treaty itself which even now, not without cause, does not enjoy the confidence of part of the international community.

This leads me to speak briefly about the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation at this stage does not want to make a value judgement on the work of the Committee itself, but would rather draw a preliminary conclusion. The Committee must be able to discharge the functions entrusted to it as the sole multilateral negotiating body. It has been clearly laid down that the problems of disarmament, given the interdependence of the world today, are the concern of all - without particular responsibility naturally reserved for the major Powers. But all responsibility is accompanied by a duty and that duty entails at a certain stage the necessity of associating the negotiating body in the work, its membership being limited precisely for that reason.

All bilateral or trilateral negotiations which have to be reflected in the texts and treaties to be submitted to all States so that they may subscribe to them - and I am thinking of the negotiations on the banning of chemical weapons and on banning nuclear tests because these are still on the agenda of the Committee - must necessarily be the subject of detailed reports to the Committee on Disarmament in order to enable it to discharge the functions for which it was created.

I now come to an aspect of the arms race to which my country also attaches great importance: namely, that of the manufacture, trading in and transfer of conventional weapons which, directly or indirectly, threaten regional stability, peace and security, and jeopardize our efforts to establish a more just international economic order.

Steps towards disarmament must also be taken within this context, subject to the right of States to safeguard their national defence and security, and also the right of people struggling for their liberation.

(Mrs. Gordah, Tunisia)

We could, for example, consider the examination of that item by the Disarmament Commission.

We have placed great hope in the proposal of France to convene a disarmament conference in Europe, a geographical region where the rivalry of the major military alliances is at the very centre of the unbridled nuclear and conventional arms races. The coastal States of the Mediterranean whose security depends to a large extent upon that of Europe cannot remain indifferent to that idea. That explains the interest of my Government in the conference on the security and co-operation of Europe.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country raised this question at the rostrum of the General Assembly when he said:

"Acting in its geographical context, Tunisia believes that the States bordering on the Mediterranean constitute a group that is united by a common destiny and that, therefore, it is most important for them to work towards a policy of security aimed particularly at turning that interior sea into a peaceful lake.

"This process, which culminated in Helsinki, which was discussed again in Belgrade and in Malta, and which will also be dealt with soon in Madrid, contains the seeds of a new relationship based on security and co-operation and the search for complementarity rather than antagonism" (A/34/PV.12, pp. 53-55).

The third-world countries are concerned by the increase in the nuclear potential of South Africa and Israel which has been creating a very serious situation liable to jeopardize the prospects for creating denuclearized zones in Africa and the Middle East. My delegation is particularly concerned at the announcement made a few days ago about a nuclear explosion which the South African régime was reported to have set off. That act constitutes defiance of our Organization and poses very serious threats to peace and security, not only in Africa but in the world at large.

We have already had occasion in the past to warn the international community against the dangers of nuclear co-operation which certain Western countries and Israel have been according to to the racist régime in defiance of resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

(Mrs. Gordah, Tunisia)

Our apprehensions have now been entirely vindicated.

The will of the States of the Middle East to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone has come up against the formidable potential of the most sophisticated weapons, including nuclear weapons, possessed by Israel which unfortunately benefits from assistance of the same kind as that accorded to South Africa.

If the United Nations does not take determined action to enforce the application of the resolutions it has adopted, is it not to be feared that certain countries of these regions will seek to acquire, in their turn, equivalent means to ensure their security? It is for this reason that my delegation believes that we should support the proposal of a provisional committee to convene a conference in Sri Lanka in 1981 to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

The danger of nuclear proliferation should not be allowed to constitute a brake on the peaceful use of nuclear energy for purposes of development or further to block opportunities for such use. The United Nations has just devoted an international conference to the subject of science and technology for development and it would be regrettable if the developing countries were not able to use the contribution of nuclear energy to overcome their lag in development and to meet more effectively their immense needs in all areas.

(Mrs. Gordah, Tunisia)

Furthermore, the right of access to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is explicitly laid down in the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

My country belongs to that group of third-world nations which, on the domestic front has been devoting the bulk of its resources to development and which in external affairs has been basing its policy on the principles of mutual respect, and sovereign equality among States and peoples.

The process of détente must therefore be clearly highlighted in order to dispel fears which prompt countries, particularly those of the third world, to intensify their arms acquisition to the detriment of development resources.

At a time when the United Nations is on the brink of the Third Development Decade, it is necessary to provide it with the resources it needs to reach its goals by placing disarmament at the service of development.

Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): "The link between disarmament and the settlement of regional and international disputes is very close. The repercussions between these problems are clear, as indicated in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. The conclusion that can be drawn from that Document is that any progress in disarmament must to a large extent hinge on a settlement of regional problems.

Obviously the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a basic step towards general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, nuclear disarmament. But the creation of such zones calls for their effective and total denuclearization. This principle flows from the report of the governmental experts, drafted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3261 (XXIX), paragraph 90 of which states:

"Nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangements must ensure that the zone would be, and would remain, effectively free of all nuclear weapons. The zone arrangements must contain an effective system of verification to ensure full compliance with the agreed obligations." (A/10027/Add.1, para. 90)

Another paragraph of that same report reads as follows:

"The experts consider that the basic principle governing the creation of denuclearized zones is the prohibition of the production or acquisition of fissile material by the countries composing that zone and parties to the treaty."

In the operative part of resolution 3263 (XXIX) of December 1964 with regard to the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone the General Assembly:

"1. Commends the idea of the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East;

"2. Considers that, in order to advance the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, it is indispensable that all parties concerned in the area proclaim solemnly and immediately their intention to refrain, on a reciprocal basis, from producing, testing, obtaining, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons."

/...

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

That resolution also

"Calls upon the parties concerned in the area to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" and

"Expresses the hope that all States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States, will lend their full co-operation for the effective realization of the aims of the present resolution."

During the thirtieth regular session of the General Assembly, in 1975, the Assembly reiterated its previous appeal to all parties concerned to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty in order to achieve these goals and to ensure the goodwill of these countries with regard to the implementation of the principles contained in that resolution. At the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly, in 1978, the Assembly asked all States to subject their nuclear activities to the safeguards and guarantees of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). My country has from the very outset subscribed to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, whereas Israel has not done so. Israel is trying to acquire nuclear weapons, as is daily announced in the mass media. This attests to the bad faith and intentions of Israel with regard to its adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In the course of the introduction of the first of the resolutions on the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, Iran and Egypt stressed the role that could be played by non-nuclear-weapon States in the creation of denuclearized zones. Egypt said that adherence to the Treaty was a prior condition for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. These conditions have been reiterated in all subsequent resolutions on the subject. Yet Israel has continued to reject those resolutions and others of the General Assembly concerning this matter.

So far Israel has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which indicates its intentions in the matter. Although Israel has not categorically refused to adhere to the Treaty itself, the conditions that it has imposed go even beyond a categorical refusal. Thus the proposal to make the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone faces an unsurmountable obstacle, since Israel is the only country of the region which, in the course of the votes taken every year,

/...



(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

refuses to support resolutions concerning the establishment of that area as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, imposes conditions and continues to try to obtain political advantages.

We know what the results of the votes on this question have been in the First Committee and the General Assembly, and we do not have to stress that again. But every year the number of the countries supporting these resolutions grows. A mere comparison of the results of the votes at the twenty-ninth session in 1974 and the thirty-third session in 1978 attests to that statement.

The basic elements which still make the situation ever more precarious and dangerous are as we see them, the following. First, Israel has not adhered to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; secondly, Israel continues to refuse to allow its nuclear activities and institutions to be placed under the safeguards of the IAEA; thirdly, we are almost convinced that Israel now in fact possesses nuclear weapons, and I shall later in my statement give the evidence that leads us to this conviction. Israel has entered the phase of the production of conventional weapons and their sale to countries known for their aggressive policies. That in itself is a troubling element in certain regions of the world, such as southern Africa; I am also thinking of the régime of Somoza and others.

If differences of view and approach in different regions have delayed the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the main differences of opinion existing between the countries of the Middle East and Africa, on the one hand, and the régimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria, on the other, make it impossible for us to hope to achieve our objective of having the Middle East and Africa declared nuclear-weapon-free zones. The differences between the two parties go beyond mere formalities; they touch upon the very survival of the illegal racist régimes and concern principles of international law, the terms of the charter, the right of peoples to self-determination, the non-use of force in international relations, respect for independence, sovereignty and human rights, the struggle against racism and apartheid, and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

The areas of the Middle East and Africa are two exceptional cases quite different from that of Latin America. So long as the problems of occupied territories and of peoples that are dispersed or whose livelihood is threatened remain unsolved, the quest for more sophisticated weapons will continue and be intensified.

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

With regard to the security of these illegal régimes and their need to obtain nuclear weapons in order to assure their survival, the answers given have always been included in reports. In paragraph 84, of the report to which I have referred it is stated:

(spoke in English)

"The premise upon which any nuclear-weapon-free zone must be based will be the conviction of States that their vital security interests would be enhanced and not jeopardized by participation. It was argued by several experts that the presence of nuclear weapons in regions would threaten the security of States in that region, not excluding the possessor of the weapons or the country in which they are deployed, and that there is accordingly a junction of national and regional interests in regions where these weapons do not exist in ensuring their total absence. The situation in areas where nuclear weapons are already present will be different and will raise particular issues for the security of States. These issues would have to form a major consideration in any proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Several experts pointed out that there may be regions in which nuclear-weapon-free zones are impracticable or where their creation may not improve the security of the States of the area."

(continued in Arabic)

Thus the experts refute the theory of deterrence that Israel and South Africa are trying to use as far as their neighbours are concerned.

The Middle East and Africa represent two analogous situations, since both regions are developing areas torn asunder by internal conflicts of all kinds and also are beset by the catastrophe embodied in foreign occupation, racial discrimination and the exploitation of their national resources by intruders and colonizers. The very serious situations in the Middle East and in South Africa, make the acquisition of nuclear weapons under any guise a matter of grave concern to all the countries neighbouring on those regions that feel themselves directly affected.

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Nuclear weapons in the hands of the racists of South Africa do not, it is true, threaten the United States of America or other continents of the world. So, too, the nuclear weapons held by the racist Zionist authorities are a threat only to the Arabs. But those held by South Africa threaten the entire African continent, and particularly the neighbours of South Africa. Vorster had the arrogance to threaten President Kaunda in 1970 openly by saying,

(spoke in English)

"Zambia would be hit so hard that she would never forget it".

(continued in Arabic)

Israel's policy as a whole, its refusal to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian peoples and the justice of the Arab cause, and its obstinate refusal also to consider the arguments raised against its stand lead us to believe that the positions it takes are based on the very same definitions given by Vorster for the South African positions. I shall not go into theoretical or philosophical disquisitions here on the principle that the agreement of the countries of a single region is not necessary in order to make that zone a nuclear-weapon-free zone, but I will say that the specific situation prevailing in Africa and in the Middle East makes such a theory valid because Israel and South Africa are not ordinary States in those regions. Each is based on aggression and on the theory of the supremacy of the strongest, on which their constitutions and their legal institutions rest. Therefore, their acceptance of the two regions as nuclear-weapon-free zones and their obedience to the will of the international community represented by the United Nations must be considered a prior condition for the implementation of the principles endorsed by the entire world, which call for the Middle East and South Africa to be declared nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Paragraph 65 of the Final Document states:

"It is imperative, as an integral part of the effort to halt and reverse the arms race, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The goal of nuclear non-proliferation is on the one hand to prevent

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

the emergence of any additional nuclear-weapon States besides the existing five nuclear-weapon States, and on the other progressively to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons altogether."

But this implies obligations and responsibilities for the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States equally. The former commit themselves to put a stop to the nuclear weapons race and to disarm and implement the principles contained in the pertinent paragraphs of the present Final Document. And all States commit themselves to avoid and prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In the light of the principles contained in the paragraph I have quoted and of the resolutions I have mentioned concerning the Middle East, may I wonder aloud whether Israel has in fact complied with those principles and resolutions, or has - as we all know it has - redoubled its efforts to acquire nuclear weapons as has its ally in the south of Africa, each applying the policy of hegemonism in the region in which it is situated.

The world press brings us news daily of the Israeli nuclear armament and of co-operation between Israel and South Africa. Research and studies have been conducted on these matters that have certainly not been nnn overlooked in United Nations documents. Dr. Fouad-Eabur, in his book Israel and Nuclear Weapons, has pointed out what was revealed in a Time magazine article of 12 April 1976 entitled, "How did Israel Obtain the Bomb?", wherein it was indicated that Israel's nuclear programme, as defined in the first years of that country's existence has been followed. However, a new system was added for the refining of uranium from phosphates mined in the Negev, as well as another for the producing of heavy water for use in the reactors. The Atomic Energy Agency of Israel was created by a special committee and is attached to the Israeli Ministry of Defence.

In the 1950s a number of nuclear States gave all types of assistance to Israel for the implementation of its nuclear programme. After the 1956 Suez war Israel took the decision to continue the building of its Daimona reactor. I need not go into the details of the aid received by

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Israel or speak of the reasons that have led many countries to co-operate with it. In 1964 the Daimona reactor was started up, and when its existence was discovered the Israelis invented a story to the effect that it was a textile plant in the Negev Desert. This was a complete farce about Jewish specialization in the textile industry, and it was mentioned by Robert Harkavy in a book entitled Spectre of a Middle Eastern Holocaust.

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Kennedy Administration pressed Israel because of the existence of the Daimona reactor, and finally Israel obtained rockets, in order to hold back on the manufacture of uranium and the operation of its reactor.

Israel has also produced the "Jericho" ballistic rocket also known as the ID-60. Israel has launched a campaign to convince world public opinion that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons in the Middle East, at a time when the Daimona reactor was just beginning to function. May I cite here eee  
aa a paragraph from the book by Robert Markavy regarding the functioning of the Daimona reactor:

(spoke in English)

"... it has a power output of around 16 megawatts with a potential plutonium output at low band up to an equivalent of around 1.2 Hiroshima-size 20 kiloton nuclear weapons per year."

(continued in Arabic)

The next stage that followed the 1967 decision led to the setting up of a plutonium separation plant, which was completed in 1969. On 5 May 1968, Der Spiegel published an article, basing itself on authorized sources, saying that Israel possessed a number of completed bombs. On 18 July 1970 and on 5 October 1971, The New York Times confirmed that, if Israel did not possess nuclear weapons, it did at least possess the necessary elements to manufacture bombs, and had carried out the necessary studies and preparations to manufacture bombs in case of emergency or crisis.

The statement by a former President of Israel, E. Katzir, who arrogantly said that Israel possessed a nuclear capability, confirms all the information nnn I have just mentioned. The Christian Science Monitor on 4 December 1967 published the same information. As the Christian Science Monitor stated, several "Jericho" rockets were produced every month. Robert Markavy in his book stated:

(spoke in English)

"If we presume that the Daimona reactor started to function in 1964 or 1965, and if its capacity was of 26 megawatts, a 20-kilowatt bomb which needs 8 kg of plutonium to be effective, we can conclude that the production of bombs by Israel amounted to 1 or 2 bombs per year over the last 12 years."

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

(continued in Arabic)

After all this, the leaders of the Zionist group and their friends in the world - at the head of which stands the United States - have offered different theories, such as the theory of nuclear balance in the Middle East put forward by Robert Tucker and Stephen Cozen, and this serves a two-fold purpose. One is to justify Israel's atomic programme and, secondly, to exercise pressure and blackmail on the American authorities, in order to persuade the authorities in Washington to allow Israel to make more sophisticated weapons. After the CIA announcement and after the article published by Time magazine on this matter, stating that Israel had in fact manufactured 30 nuclear bombs in the course of the 1973 war, this was later confirmed by other sources. The Defence and Foreign Affairs Daily of 8 March 1967 under the headline "CIA briefing confirms earlier reports" adds that these bombs have been stockpiled somewhere in the Sahara and are ready to be used in case of need.

With regard to the Libyan commercial aircraft that was buzzed and bombed,, it has been found that this occurred when the plane went near the silos containing those bombs; but Israel ploughed up the land and accused anyone who might have revealed this truth of being troublemakers and muckrakers.

This is to show Israel's efforts to maintain and stockpile nuclear weapons. This policy is based on the theory of the balance of terror - and nuclear terror at that. They are overlooking the fact that the people of the region and people all over the world will one day have to face this open threat by creating means of verification and thus enforcing a balance in the situation.

(spoke in English)

"A nuclear balance of terror might even be the most likely route to stability in the Middle Eastern context. In a nuclear-free Middle East, Arab psychology would remain tied to the image of a positive and growing momentum."

(continued in Arabic)

This is the Israeli logic. Israel adopts a well-known position regarding the proposals to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Israel prefers the nuclear choice, despite the appeals made and despite the refutation

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

of the application of the theory of nuclear balance, the theory of ambiguity and its alternatives, or the "bombs in the basement" theory of nuclear superiority.

Having followed in the footsteps of the United States for many years, Israel has introduced the bomb in the Middle East, as South Africa has done in Africa. But Israel bears the greatest responsibility in these matters, and it becomes clear that this proliferation and dissemination of nuclear weapons can only lay upon nuclear-weapon States a tremendous responsibility which they will have to shoulder if anything occurs. It is the nuclear-weapon States which must ensure the non-proliferation of those nuclear weapons, and it is they that must guarantee the survival of the countries in the region.

We are not overlooking the threat to international peace and security inherent in the irresponsible practices that are left unpunished. Security in the Middle East depends to a large extent on security in the Mediterranean and i in the Indian Ocean, which in turn depend on security in Europe and in Asia, in a word, on international peace and security. Therefore the theory of the balance of terror must be rejected as a basis for international relations.

Today the world is clamouring for a policy of détente, yet we see that the Zionist entity has chosen the nuclear alternative and seeks allies to break the isolation to which its policies of aggression have condemned it. The major ally of Israel is the apartheid group in southern Africa. United Nations research and studies have shown the very close relationship and co-operation that exist between these two countries in all fields, particularly the nuclear and military. As far as I am concerned, it is sufficient merely to recall the contents of the report of the Special Committee on Apartheid, document A/31/22/Add.2 of 13 September 1976, entitled "Relations between Israel and South Africa", to have these arguments borne out, as well as the book "The Nuclear Axis" by Barbara Rogers and Zdenek Cervenka.

I would refer the Committee also to a reference in Newsweek to a book, "Israel and South Africa" by Stephen Richards and El-Messirid. May I also refer it to the Star of Johannesburg of 30 March 1977, the Financial Times of 7 August 1967, the Washington Post of 8 July 1975 and The New York Times of 18 August 1976. Suffice it to quote Robert Harkavy in his book which I have already mentioned:



(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

(spoke in English)

"There is one other possible use for Israel's nuclear technology, however, admittedly highly conjectural, and that is as a diplomatic bargaining chip ... there are possibilities for Israel, however, dangerous and perhaps counter productive, of using the threat of transfer of nuclear technology or even of finished atomic weapons to other nascent or aspiring forces to ward off or counter internal pressures.

"In 1976, for example, there were indications (engendered by the well-publicized trip of Prime Minister Vorster to Israel, among other things), of a growing Israel-South African military nexus."

(continued in Arabic)

Robert Harkavy goes on to say that this co-operation between Israel and South Africa is full and comprehensive, since Israel possesses the experience and the capacity to produce weapons, whereas South Africa possesses the greatest reserves of uranium. Apart from this nuclear co-operation, everybody knows about the sale of Kafir aircraft and "Reshef" rockets and the exchange of mercenaries. Despite the scope of the international dialogue taking place on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, despite the danger inherent in the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, despite the warnings regarding co-operation between Israel and South Africa, despite the positions adopted by the two régimes on matters of interest to the third world, the full dimensions of the problem of Israel's nuclear weaponry and the threat inherent in it have not been understood. We do not believe that the nuclear-weapon States have been able to stop Israel or South Africa from acquiring nuclear weapons, and therefore they have not been able to put an end to the proliferation of nuclear weaponry. Now that the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference is near we must warn the world of this danger. It is a danger that could lead to a very rapid proliferation of nuclear weapons. The international community has in theory and almost in practice accepted the role the nuclear-weapon States, particularly the United States and the Soviet Union, will have to play in this matter.

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted a number of paragraphs to this very concept, which has been reiterated in many international conventions. During the tenth special session a number of delegations stressed the importance of the agreement on the non-proliferation of strategic weapons concluded by the Soviet Union and the United States, and the repercussions of that agreement on international peace and security.

My delegation has stressed the responsibility of these two States, particularly in the Middle East, not only because we want the Middle East to be declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone, but in order to eliminate the specific conditions that endanger peace, stability and security in the Middle East and thus make it necessary for other countries of the region to seek to acquire nuclear weapons.

The international community itself must impose its will on Israel and force it to accept the safeguards and guarantees of the International Atomic Energy Agency. This is essential to any efforts to make the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In the Middle East and in Africa the nuclear countries must assume their responsibilities in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the international conventions they have signed. These countries must exert pressure on the racist régimes in Tel-Aviv and Pretoria and any other similar régime to stop them acquiring nuclear weapons. They must also put an end to the supply of nuclear and fissionable material that may be used for two different purposes. The system of international guarantees provided for in the Non-Proliferation Treaty must be complied with, as must that of the IAEA, and these must be imposed on those régimes.

The nuclear Powers must give negative guarantees not to use nuclear weapons against States which have acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Other appropriate guarantees and safeguards must also be defined and applied to put an end to any and all nuclear threats directed against non-nuclear-weapon States. Once the necessary precautions and safeguards have been adopted the conditions conducive to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones will exist and co-operation among the members of the international community will have begun. It should be borne in mind that injustice gives rise to hatred, and hatred in turn calls for vengeance.

Mr. IADIPO (Benin)(interpretation from French): The delegation of the People's Republic of Benin will today, as it has in the past, attempt to contribute to the heart of its ability to the solution of a problem that the entire world is unanimous in recognizing as important and as one that must be definitively solved in the interests of all mankind.

Obviously, the frequently demonstrated arrogance of the major Western Powers might lead us to regard as futile attempts by certain small countries like my own to contribute to this solution, non-participants as we are in the insensate competition in which the great Powers and their protégés are engaged to create instruments of violent death.

Of course, it is becoming more difficult each day to contribute any fundamentally new elements to a lengthy debate in which every aspect of the problem has already been studied in every possible way and in which every imaginable realistic solution has been put forward, without any sign of success.

We cannot, however, stand idly by and accept the role of potential and innocent victims that the great Powers, nuclear and non-nuclear alike, are attempting to impose upon us.

The people of Benin, in any case, feel themselves in no way bound to serve as martyrs or as lambs led to the slaughter. Our people have no intention of remaining silent and passively allowing themselves to be murdered in cold blood by those very Powers which, for their own selfish interests, have transformed our globe into a jungle in which might is right.

Just as in the past we have never resigned ourselves to foreign domination and exploitation, just as in the very recent past we resolutely opposed any attempt at colonial reconquest, so today we shall continue to speak out within this world Organization until the irresponsible game in which the great Powers are engaged has been brought to an end, a game the cost of which is today being borne by the peoples of the developing countries but may be borne by the entire human race tomorrow.

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

Nor does the delegation of the People's Republic of Benin have any intention of engaging in a rhetorical exercise or of participating in a ritual ceremony, still less of uttering incantations intended to conjure up some kind of inevitable fate. Such has been the impression gained from nearly a month of general debate in this Committee on the control of weapons and on disarmament. Unless the major Powers can be made finally to accept their individual responsibilities by returning to the path of honour and justice, our delegation will feel impelled to unmask their manoeuvres so that all the peoples of the world who love peace and justice in freedom and independence may clearly identify those who bear the true responsibility.

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

Every delegation that has spoken in this room before us, without exception has proclaimed the purity of its Government's intentions in the matter of international peace and security. Nevertheless, since the beginning of this thirty-fourth session, regular troops, on the orders of legal Governments, have intervened in other independent countries, violating the sovereignty of those States, preventing the peoples from enjoying the fruits of their just social struggles and sacrifices, committing acts of provocation and aggression and occupying the territories of other peoples because of their own superior strength.

Control of nuclear weapons, as well as general disarmament, has become by force of circumstances one of the central elements of the policy of the People's Republic of Benin. It is only because it is a small country concerned more with overcoming its under-development than with arming itself and dominating others that my country has a vital interest in the struggle for strict and effective control over nuclear and conventional weapons until we can arrive at the lowest level of equilibrium and work out more effective machinery for bringing about general and complete disarmament. But on this subject the arguments of our delegation obviously cannot be exactly the same as those of many other delegations here, which speak on behalf of heavily armed States which are potential users of those weapons.

My country, as I said before, is a small developing country which can rightly be considered unarmed and as representing no danger to disarmament, but which may become the victim of militaristic and belligerent States.

Similarly, at times we plead just as much with our hearts as with our minds; therefore members of this Committee may forgive us for being less dispassionate, less eloquent, less general and perhaps less technical in what we say, but, above all, more passionate, more anxious to avoid the trap of the abstractions of certain ideological, moralistic and pseudo-pacifist dialectics. We are fundamentally attached to the presentation of a rational analysis of a phenomenon that certain people are interested in persuading us possesses its own dynamics, independent of political will, because our objective is to reveal the true reasons for the present inaction of the international community and the good or bad faith of each party.

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

In December 1969 the proclamation of the First Disarmament Decade indicated awareness of the danger posed to mankind if an end was not put to the folly of the arms race, as well as the real will of the international community to acquire specific means of struggling against the proliferation of those weapons of mass destruction and in that way to preserve our world from a new holocaust, which, after so many years of futile debate, seemed likely to be the last one.

Pursuing this concern still further, in May and June of 1978, the General Assembly, at its tenth special session, after having defined a Programme of Action, reorganized the old deliberative, negotiating and study bodies and created new ones, expressly invited the First Committee to occupy itself in the future only with questions of disarmament and related questions of international security. For, between these two initiatives, the production and proliferation of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction had paradoxically, increased and the risk of the last world war had grown dangerously.

Today, approximately 15 months after that second initiative, which we believe to be a historic one, almost every statement made every day for over a month in this Committee has clearly shown that the frustrations, anxieties and terror of peoples have no reason to come to an end in the face of the apparent incapacity of our Organization and of its General Assembly to do anything but utter prayers and other incantations through resolutions without practical effect while millions of United States dollars continue to be spent every day on increasing the instruments of sudden death.

An objective look at the past few years certainly reveals some progress in the field of arms control, as well as in that of disarmament, since there is reason to be gratified by the conclusion of a dozen or so agreements. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, concluded in 1968, to which only 110 States Members of the Organization have to date adhered, has more or less played its part as indispensable machinery for preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Also, an effective Treaty was finally signed following negotiations on the denuclearization of the sea bed, as was as a Convention prohibiting bacteriological, biological and toxin weapons. Generally speaking, serious efforts have been made multilaterally to limit the

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

military use that might be made of all the latest advances in high level technology.

Furthermore, the work within the framework of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the United States and the Soviet Union has fundamentally fulfilled our expectations since it resulted in the vital SALT II agreement between those two States. The People and Government of Benin warmly welcome the conclusion of that agreement in spite of certain concern with regard to its ratification in view of the tergiversations and agitations which, in certain quarters preceded or followed its conclusion. It cannot be denied that this is the outstanding achievement in a decade rich in futile activities and declarations, because throughout this period the development in the quantity and quality of nuclear weapons and the degree of sophistication attained by conventional weapons has never been more evident. It would even appear that annual expenditures on armaments increased from \$US 200 billion to \$US 450 billion in the space of 10 years, while only \$US 23 billion a year was devoted to international assistance during the same period. Obviously, in practice the connexion between disarmament and the search for international peace and security has never been made.

An influential delegation to the Organization even attempted, in this very Committee to justify this state of affairs during the first week of our debate by explaining that

"a revolution in man's thinking is indispensable so that nations consider their security as a function of the reduction of the weapons which in the past were often the only means they had of ensuring their security".

Of course, the aspiration of States to protect their sovereignty and to promote their internal security is understandable and legitimate, but every day facts show that it is not this legitimate aspiration that threatens international peace and security. And that delegation, in our view is also seeking to sow confusion when it pretends to believe and tries to make us believe that all States arm themselves only for the defence of nations. What nation do they want to defend, and what nation did they defend by manufacturing, arming themselves with

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

and using cluster bombs, fragmentation bombs and other anti-personnel weapons in 1972, 1973 and 1974? It was obviously not the legitimate leaders of the so often martyred Vietnamese people, who had armed themselves for the defence of the Vietnamese country and nation.

How does what is happening now in Guantanamo, in the independent and free Republic of Cuba and in Central Africa, which is tantamount, in our opinion, to deliberate provocation of the peoples of those countries, contribute to the security of any nation?

Of course, the Latin adage "If you want peace, prepare for war" dies hard, but it is obvious that it is not we who are perpetuating this, we, the small progressive countries, naturally devoted to the international peace and security which are indispensable to our development; it is not our States that, while waiting for this hypothetical "revolution in thinking" to take place of its own accord, are preparing and organizing wars of aggression, exporting weapons and political and military hegemonism to southern Africa, the Middle East, the Caribbean and so on; the list is not exhaustive.



(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

What about the bad faith of certain great Powers? Today, one could write several long books consisting of the resolutions and other documents of our Organization which are related to the control of arms and to disarmament, and which have still not been put into practice, or barely so.

The nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is, in spite of everything, regarded today in Africa and the Middle East as a fools' bargain. The overwhelming majority of our States have in fact adhered to it, in spite of the risk of political and military blackmail entailed in the continuation by the racist and fascist minority régime in South Africa and by the Zionist State of Israel of the development of their nuclear armament programme, with the knowledge and in the sight of all. In so doing, some of our States have placed their confidence in the good faith of certain great influential Powers in this Organization which would be able to nip in the bud this defiance, which greatly endangers not only fighting Africa, but the world as a whole. It would seem that this confidence was ill-founded; because it is those same great Powers which, not content with tolerating and actually objectively encouraging the arrogance of the racist and fascist minorities and of the Zionists in their constant defiance of the resolutions and other relevant decisions of the international community, thus harming the credibility of our Organization, have directly and indirectly by means of private companies been actively providing these States with indispensable nuclear patents and nuclear plants. In this way they have placed themselves in open opposition to the objectives of the Treaty and by their deeds have rejected even before they existed the conclusions of the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, contained in document S/13157, dated 9 March 1979.

As to the Treaty on the complete banning of nuclear tests, it has not yet become reality after a quarter of a century of discussion. There is serious cause for concern about hopes for an early conclusion to such discussions when one considers that there have been 48 nuclear explosions during the course of 1978.

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

The Treaty on the total prohibition of the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons, as well as the destruction of existing stocks, has suffered a similar lack of progress, despite the apparent unanimity of States in considering it as an urgent and important measure within the framework of disarmament. Here, the lack of real political will seems to have been compounded by the difficulty of reconciling the fairly advanced negotiation between the two military super-Powers and the multilateral negotiations for which a mandate has been given to the Committee on Disarmament. Everyone seems to agree on the universal scope of the commitment sought here, to the extent that everyone can easily acquire a weapon the technology for the manufacture of which is very widespread.

Likewise - to avoid what threatens to be an endless listing of documents - a certain number of conventions or treaties on the non-use of nuclear force, against the installation of these weapons by the nuclear Powers, advocating the cessation of the production of fissile material and the cessation of the production of nerve gases as well as the destruction of stockpiles of such gases and so on, have finally, after years of fruitless discussion, been entrusted to the Committee on Disarmament.

The need to control and reduce conventional weapons has in recent times been a constant concern of all peoples, whether their populations are great or small, whether they are developed or not, and whether they are technologically advanced or not, even when it has not been the concern of their States.

The last two world wars, like the various wars of aggression and colonial reconquest of recent years, have been waged and continue to be waged with conventional weapons which have attained a degree of sophistication in their destructive capacity and their power to kill that continues to increase. Why, then, has it never been possible to translate this fine unanimity into practice so that some bloodshed might be spared and the organized international community might justify its existence?

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

In truth, we could go on indefinitely asking questions about everything of which the international community has become aware, about everything that should have been decided and that has not been decided, about everything that should have been carried out and that has not been, and about many other declarations of good intent which have paved the way to that hell where we are forced to live.

All the evidence points to a deliberate stalling here, and in the view of our delegation, this stalling was foreseeable in a world where all events are related and where, even as I speak, the international situation is made more tense by the determination of imperialist and reactionary forces to endanger, for selfish interests, international peace and the security of small countries which have been practically stripped of the means of defending themselves.

From our point of view, the world political situation is marked at the present time by a fundamental contradiction which leads to the opposition of two classes of people. On the one hand there are the imperialist régimes and their capitalist monopolist associates which wage aggression against peoples in order to dominate them, dominate and oppress them in order to exploit them, and exploit them for the satisfaction of their own selfish interests. On the other hand, we have the peoples of the world, whether or not they belong to the developed countries, who are struggling to be the sole masters of their natural resources and the fruits of their labour, and who ask only for peace and security in freedom.

The main aspect of this contradiction is the strengthening of the camp of the forces of progress, a strengthening which one can clearly observe in the recent resolutions and other relevant decisions of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations.

Unfortunately, this tendency has given rise dialectically to a militarization that is growing every day in international political relations, since imperialism and reaction no longer shrink from violating openly and flagrantly the principles of our Charter by institutionalizing arrogance, threats and brute force as a mode of conduct thus endangering at the same time the prestige and credibility of our Organization as well as international peace.

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

Our delegation is among those which cannot interpret otherwise the thinly-veiled threats and certain recent brutal interventions by some States that are even represented in this Committee. These are threats addressed to sovereign peoples to prevent them from exercising their just sovereignty over their natural resources, and interventions designed to prevent these peoples from taking charge of their own destiny.

We live in a world where more than a billion people are suffering from hunger and malnutrition, where a quarter of the children born in developing countries die before they are five years old, and where among the three quarters who survive, most suffer a diminished vitality as a result of insufficient food; we live in a world where almost a billion people are illiterate and in spite of all the progress which might have been expected in education it is to be feared that illiteracy is making further inroads among their children; we live in a world where the average life expectancy in the under developed countries, which are euphemistically called today "developing countries", is nearly 20 years less than in the Western countries, where a third of the population enjoys more than three quarters of the world's income.

In such a world, can one regard as an excessive demand the simple wish to be the master of one's own natural resources, even if these do include petroleum, and to enjoy the fruits of one's own labour? Certainly not.

But this is not the opinion of certain States subject to the capitalist bourgeoisies. This is not the view of the multinational companies which now operate in parallel with those States with which they share the task of giving good or bad marks, stabilizing and strengthening here the racist and fascist dictatorships of southern Africa and elsewhere, contributing there to the economic stifling and destabilization of popular régimes, even sometimes resorting to armed intervention by regulars or mercenaries, when all their other schemes are not sufficient. In the view of the imperialist and reactionary forces, the peoples of the world have the right only to behave peacefully while they are being exploited and repressed.

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

The delegation of the People's Republic of Benin, in presenting its analysis, speaks with a knowledge of the facts, since its country has directly experienced this very situation, and physically suffered from it.

It was a Sunday morning, 33 and a half months ago, on 16 January 1977. A horde of drugged mercenaries armed to the teeth committed cowardly aggression against the peaceful people of Benin while they were engaged in the tasks of national construction and production. Our people were armed with nothing but their enthusiasm, and an unshakable faith in the course of honour and dignity. This is a course we have followed since 26 October 1972, when we decisively threw out the lackeys of those who were serving the will of the imperialists in our country.

Our people also believed naively in the professions of faith of certain great Powers, the type of profession of faith that our delegation has been hearing here for a month, in which they acknowledge, among other things, the inalienable right of peoples to choose for themselves a mode of development adapted to their objective and subjective needs, as well as the sovereignty over all their natural resources.

Our people almost fell victim to its own excessive confidence in the capacity of the international community to apply the principles of the Charter of our Organization and in the political will of certain great Powers in the West to adhere to this in practice.

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

Our countrymen, armed with clubs and scythes, had to fight against the internationally recruited and organized outlaws, who were armed with sophisticated weapons by the forces of reaction which wanted to carry out a war of colonial reconquest against our country. Happily, our patriotic armed forces triumphed and in spite of their outmoded weapons and numerical inferiority their valour and exemplary spirit of self-sacrifice obliged the mercenary army to flee after three hours of murderous combat.

Supposing for a moment that we had not had this minimum of self-defence to repel the aggressive mercenaries, our people would have been massacred, our country would have been recolonized, our liberty and our independence would have been taken away from us once again, to the profit of the sordid interests of the imperialists.

If, on Sunday, 16 January 1977, our country had had an anti-aircraft defence system, modern fighter aircraft and other sophisticated weapons the plane carrying the mercenaries would not have been able with impunity to overfly its air space, terrorizing the people of the town of Cotonou. That plane would not have been able to take off and disappear mysteriously, and the delegation of Benin would immediately have had further proof in order to confound the delegations of certain accomplice States which, in bad faith, have tried to prevail upon our Organization to doubt the actual fact of the aggression itself.

The People's Republic of Benin was therefore forced by threats against its security to seek the most effective means of protecting its people. If we had to divert some of our meagre resources which had been reserved for economic and social development for the purposes of self-defence, it was the forces of imperialism and reaction which imposed that upon us and continue to do so, just as they did on the morrow of the Second World War on the socialist countries of Europe and as they have done and continue to do on the progressive and anti-imperialist régimes in Latin America, Asia and Africa, which they force to arm themselves and to seek costly military means of self-defence and protection.

It is on the following that our delegation wishes to lay stress in this part of our statement: first, over-armament at the present time is essentially linked,

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

from all standpoints, with the manoeuvres of the international imperialists, which are constantly perfecting their means of political domination and economic exploitation; secondly, and consequently, the arms race derives directly from the threats of aggression of the imperialists, which themselves thus create the psychological conditions for it; thirdly, the aspirations of States to protect their sovereignty and to promote their security is perfectly understandable and logical; what are not are the confusing tactics aimed at leaving the impression that all States are only arming themselves to protect their sovereignty.

As all the world knows and as the great Powers scrupulously avoid mentioning, one of the basic reasons for the virtual standstill of current efforts to achieve disarmament, is, the fact that the industry of death is flourishing in the capitalist West, where it is earning enormous profits for individuals, bringing employment to thousands and thus resolving certain social problems posed by the greatest crisis which capitalism has ever known, that of unemployment. It is also bringing about the reconversion of certain types of industry, while posing a serious problem in the present economic situation, which is obviously not at all to the liking of everyone.

All these considerations lead us to reaffirm, as we did a year ago, the fact that as long as we continue to deal with all the problems of disarmament and refuse obstinately to link them with their causes, our results will continue to fall far short of reality. We must have the courage to face facts, and try to struggle together to liquidate the objective causes of the arms race so that the task entrusted to our Committee by the entire Organization will be facilitated. Otherwise, the end of the second Decade will find us once again at almost the same point.

For the people and Government of Benin, then, disarmament has a very clear significance: it means a world of security, free from the precarious balance of terror; a world where the survival of the human race will be finally guaranteed, and the renunciation of force will become a fact. It also means a world where the political will of States will make it possible to build mutual trust to take the place of the distrust and suspicion which are the general rule at present. It means, finally and above all, a world free from

(Mr. Ladipo, Benin)

the exploitation of man by man, where the necessary resources will be made available for the more rapid economic and social development of peoples, thus putting into effect a new international economic and political order and ensuring a good life for the peoples.

The First Committee will in the next few days examine a certain number of draft resolutions covering the various aspects of disarmament. Pending an opportunity to express our view specifically on each of these our delegation can now say that all draft resolutions the objective of which is disarmament for peace and development will win our sympathy and our active support, whatever the sponsorship may be. In particular, we shall support actively the draft declaration on international co-operation for disarmament presented by the delegation of Czechoslovakia, a draft which we have studied with great interest and with which we would now like to express our sympathy.

The strengthening of the principles of co-operation among States can only foster progress in the field of disarmament, thus facilitating the implementation of the conclusions of the tenth special of the General Assembly, on disarmament. We think too that such co-operation should also assist in the solution of the global problems of development and of the economic and social progress of over-exploited countries such as our own.

In the same spirit and for the same purposes we shall also support the draft resolutions submitted by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic concerning negotiations on disarmament and the various measures to be taken against the nuclear armament of South Africa. This last question concerns us particularly as a country in militant Africa, since South Africa is seeking to create the conditions for military and political blackmail.

The delegation of my country would like, in conclusion, to recall once again that all these draft resolutions will have effect only if disarmament in southern Africa means the cessation of the supply by certain Western countries of arms and licences to manufacture arms to the fascist and racist minority authorities of South Africa, because in the final analysis peace, security and the development of peoples are directly synonymous with the disappearance of the gangrene of aggressive régimes which are the enemies of the people and the instruments of destabilization.



In practice, as recommended explicitly by the United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, we should

"... adopt a mandatory decision, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to end all nuclear collaboration with South Africa, to require the dismantling of its nuclear plants and to warn the Pretoria régime that any efforts by it to continue its nuclear programme or to build a uranium enrichment plant would result in further international action, including effective collective sanctions." (S/13157, p. 1)

In our view, the hour of truth has come. The minority racists and fascists of South Africa will have nuclear weapons very soon. The great Powers, primarily the great Western Powers, will have to take a clear stand because our peoples will judge them more and more on their acts rather than on the basis of their homilies designed to lull our vigilance. Similarly, as regards the Indian Ocean, it must be made absolutely clear that disarmament cannot go hand in hand with floating or fixed bases with which the great Powers threaten the security of progressive régimes in the region. The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace must be translated into reality.

We reaffirm that in the Middle East, disarmament must mean the disappearance of a Zionist State, armed to the teeth and fundamentally expansionist, in order to create the objective conditions for the peaceful coexistence of all States in the region.

For us in Benin also, disarmament in Asia means the withdrawal of all nuclear or conventional weapons, all troops and all other instruments of war maintained by the imperialists and reactionaries in the south of Korea, which maintain the division of the Korean people. Disarmament will mean the creation of favourable conditions for the reunification of that people. Of all the conditions necessary for that reunification the most important in our view is the signing of a global peace treaty aimed at eliminating any possibility of a further serious crisis. For the revolution, the struggle continues.

Mr. CHAN YOURAN (Democratic Kampuchea)(interpretation from French): Almost 10 years have elapsed since the United Nations proclaimed the Disarmament Decade. That proclamation gave rise to great hopes and enthusiasm among the peoples of the world. However, those hopes have today given way to disappointment and pessimism as to whether mankind can go on living in peace and security. Indeed, the peoples of the world are more aware than ever of the dangers threatening their independence, sovereignty and very existence as nations and civilizations, for the plain truth is that the arms race has become the overriding reality of our time. The danger of a world war, far from having been warded off, seems more real than ever, although for the moment war has been limited to certain parts of the world -- Africa, South-East Asia, and so on. In his annual report the Secretary-General of our Organization mentioned this situation with regard particularly to South-East Asia by stating that:

"The situation which has followed the long and cruel war in Indo-China not only threatens the peace and stability of South-East Asia; it could very well also become a threat to world peace." (A/34/1, p. 5)

The fundamental cause of such a situation can be found only in the policy of hegemony and global or regional domination now prevailing in the world, to which the countries and peoples of the third world in particular have fallen victim. All the peoples that love peace, justice and independence in the world are today faced by this grave challenge of our time. They are very well aware that, while this hegemonistic and expansionist ambition of those who advocate such a policy persists, one cannot hope to put an end some day to the unbridled arms race and the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and, consequently, the clear danger of a world conflagration. The lessons learned from the Disarmament Decade leave no doubt as to the road on which the world seems to have embarked. Suffice it to recall here that the expenditures on armaments have exceeded \$400 billion a year, despite the pious wishes professed here and there in favour of disarmament, détente and international economic co-operation. That undoubtedly constitutes a scandalous challenge to mankind when billions of people languishing in misery and millions are continuing to die of hunger each year, particularly in the third world.

(Mr. Chan Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

Today nuclear tests are proceeding apace and stockpiles of nuclear weapons are continuing to increase both in quantity and quality. At the same time, the manufacturers of so-called conventional weapons are continuing their competition in the development and the perfecting of all types of such weapons at a rate so far unequalled:

In these circumstances Democratic Kampuchea, which participated in the tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, devoted to disarmament, cannot but note with regret the disappointing results in the implementation of the Programme of Action adopted at that session, which, incidentally, was convened on the initiative of the non-aligned countries.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm the position of its Government on this important question. We remain in favour of general and complete disarmament. Democratic Kampuchea is in favour of the total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and their complete elimination.

Pending the realization of that objective, the nuclear countries must solemnly commit themselves not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon countries, in particular the members of the third world. We support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world and the just claim of the non-nuclear-weapon countries to have access to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

With regard to the so-called conventional weapons, we believe that all the countries of the third world must give this question particular attention. In my delegation's view, it is urgent and imperative that the necessary measures be taken to restrict such weapons in the interest of the international community, for past and present experience has shown that these weapons are no less dangerous or lethal than nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Chan Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

Brutal reality shows us that the peoples of the third world are daily falling victim to these weapons. And the case of Kampuchea is typical. In Kampuchea more than 500,000 civilians have been massacred by these conventional weapons, consisting of rifles, tanks, cannons and planes used in the battlefield of Kampuchea by the 220,000 Vietnamese military aggressors. In the course of these ten months of invasion, the Vietnamese hordes have created tens and hundreds of Oradours and Lidices. With every day that passes hundreds of thousands die. It is a known fact that the Vietnamese aggressors do not need nuclear weapons to commit genocide against our people. But what we want to stress here is that, in order to shatter the resistance of the Kampuchean people against the Vietnamese invasion, the Hanoi authorities have used toxic chemical substances in Kampuchea in open and flagrant violation of international conventions in force prohibiting the use of such chemical weapons. Even before the invasion of December 1978 the Vietnamese aggressors had already used them in the eastern region of Kampuchea, at Kratie, Ratanakiri and Krek.

Today the Vietnamese armed forces of invasion continue to use them. I cite several examples.

On 25 and 26 July 1979 Vietnamese planes sprayed toxic chemical substances in Phnom Reachtorng in the northern part of Viriron, in the province of Kompaong Speu, causing the death of eight persons and several cases of poisoning.

On 5 and 6 September last they sprayed them on Andaung Taek and Thmar Baing in the province of Koh Kong, causing the deaths of six persons and 10 serious cases of poisoning.

On 1, 3 and 4 October last, they did the same thing in the western region of the province of Battambang, from Pailin to Poiwet over a stretch of 100 kilometres. According to the first estimates, 15 persons died, of which five were aged persons, two youths, and five children.

(Mr. Chan Youran, Democratic Kampuchea.)

On 20 October 1979 Vietnamese planes carried out a similar operation over the districts of Chhouk and Koh Sla, in the province of Kampot, in the districts of Phnom Sruoch and Kong Pisei, in the province of Kompong Speu, and in the district of Tram Kak in the province of Takeo, causing the deaths of three persons and the poisoning of 12 others.

And finally, on 26 October 1979, they sprayed route 10, between Paing Rollim and Pailin. Two children were killed and 13 others were poisoned.

In all the cases the effects and symptoms noted have been the following. The product used remains on the leaves of the trees. Any person who breathes it in immediately becomes dizzy, collapses, vomits blood, foams at the mouth and sinks into the last stages and dies within 24 hours. As for the crops of rice, maize, beans and potatoes, they shrivel and die.

The use of such weapons by the Hanoi authorities, apart from being a flagrant violation of the conventions governing this matter, show the depth of cruelty and barbarism of this war of aggression and genocide unjustly inflicted upon the people of Kampuchea, which in the space of a mere 10 months has lost more than one million of its children - killed by massacres and famine - the latter engineered by the Hanoi Government in order to exterminate our people and annex our country. The world and our Organization owe it to themselves to put an end to this the most criminal and most cynical enterprise in the history of mankind.

To this end, it is urgent that the Hanoi authorities cease their aggression against Kampuchea, withdraw all their armed occupation forces from Kampuchea and allow the people of Kampuchea to decide on their own future themselves without foreign interference, through free elections by means of direct and secret balloting under the control of the United Nations.

Mr. REBELO DE ANDRADE (Portugal): There are perhaps few forums, if any, within the United Nations to compare with this one, where a common language conceals such profound differences and opposing interests which are so difficult to reconcile. An unwitting observer listening to the general debates on disarmament could easily be convinced that beneath all our declarations lies a will to achieve common measures in this area and that, except for nuances of thought, there exists a general understanding regarding the means to be adopted in order to attain universal disarmament.

How misleading this impression is. Once we go beyond the simple enunciation of theoretical principles and of vaguely timed objectives, agreement ends; indeed, we then arrive at a point at which it is frequently only possible to approve texts containing simple guidelines by confining ourselves to abstract, if not equivocal, declarations. We can see examples of this in some provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

And this is not all. What has resulted from 34 years of discussions on disarmament, initiated with the very creation of the United Nations, and from the mechanisms derived from such discussions? Allow me to paraphrase some comments made by certain delegations on this matter.

World-wide military expenditures, which in 1970 amounted to some \$256 billion, currently are close to \$450 billion, and the tendency to increase military expenditures has grown in the latter part of the 1970s. There were more nuclear-weapon tests in 1978 - the year of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - than in any year since 1970, and the number of tests in 1979 is likely to exceed the figure for 1978. And the arms race which we are witnessing has developed such a dynamic of its own that every agreement in this field immediately speeds up research in scientific areas not covered by it, and any progress is immediately offset by an advance in arms technology.

(Mr. Rebelo de Andrade, Portugal)

After 34 years of intensive discussions in the context of the United Nations, the world-wide arms buildup has reached such a level that man is able today literally to blow up the world and to annihilate, by several means, all of mankind.

While saying this, my delegation is not oblivious of the practical measures that have been taken to control armaments. We are now in the last year of the Disarmament Decade and can point, besides the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to the conclusion of the Seabed Treaty and of the Convention Banning Biological and Toxic Weapons, as well as to the recent strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II) between the United States and the Soviet Union. These achievements fell far short of the expectations of humanity. But they should not be neglected - and particularly the last-mentioned - as a means of paving the way to further progress on the road to disarmament.

(Mr. Rebelo de Andrade, Portugal)

We should also bear in mind that, to a large extent, the progress to which I alluded was not obtained through the United Nations, but resulted from long and intensive bilateral or multilateral contacts between the major Powers. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to underestimate the role of the United Nations in this connexion, as the mouthpiece of the world conscience and as an instrument of moral pressure on the Powers on which disarmament mostly depends. We therefore consider as positive achievements the holding of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament and, in particular, the establishment of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body embracing all Member States. We also hope that the widening of the composition of the General Assembly negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, will allow more Member States to make a direct contribution to disarmament issues and we are particularly heartened by the announcement by China of its intention to join next year in the activities of the Geneva body. However, in the light of comments made here by some members of the Committee, it is still too early to make forecasts about its future effectiveness.

The first requisite on which depend any significant advances in the disarmament field is that of realism and of willingness on the part of the various Powers to avoid making suggestions for simple political gain. Proposals that are fruitless from the start because they are designed to provoke or exacerbate situations of imbalance of forces between States clearly do not engender understanding between men or serve the cause of disarmament. Paragraph 29 of the Final Document reads:

"The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage. At each stage the objective should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces". (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 29)

/...



(Mr. Rebelo de Andrade, Portugal)

My delegation feels it is in this context that the question of disarmament in general must be considered, and that thus the aspects of nuclear disarmament and the levelling of conventional forces and armaments are intimately associated. It will be impossible to accomplish nuclear disarmament in areas of the world where disequilibrium of conventional forces and armaments has led a State or group of States to rely on nuclear armaments for their own defence. In the light of the situation prevailing in central Europe, therefore, we entirely subscribe to the views of the delegations which emphasized the role of the Vienna negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions as a means of realizing substantial progress in disarmament questions. The satisfactory outcome of these negotiations can even be a condition sine qua non of any further progress in disarmament matters.

Another problem that we can point to as a source of developments of transcendental importance is that of the total cessation of nuclear tests. Special responsibilities rest on the nuclear Powers in disarmament matters, and the most positive contribution that they can immediately make to the cause of disarmament would therefore be a treaty on a comprehensive test ban. Such a treaty - and my Government hopes that, after an agreement between the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom, all the other nuclear Powers could adhere to it - would place, as has already been pointed out, an important moral constraint on the nuclear arms competition, both vertical and horizontal, and would help to promote détente. We fully understand, however, the importance of the problem of verification. We express the wish that ways and means be found in the short term to surmount it and are grateful to those nations which are actively participating in the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts created to establish a verification system based on the international exchange of seismic data.

The most relevant event that has occurred so far in the area of disarmament negotiations was undoubtedly the signing in Vienna of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. Such an event was an outstanding achievement in itself and has given men new reasons for hope in other spheres. In creating a framework of equality between two different strategic forces, the Treaty opens

/...

(Mr. Rebelo de Andrade, Portugal)

the way to greater reductions and to further qualitative restraints. We believe therefore that, following the ratification of the Treaty, new negotiations should be established in order to reach SALT III; and we hope, in particular, that these new negotiations will cover the field of nuclear continental-range missiles. This issue, however, as many other delegations pointed out, is linked to that of the balance of forces in Europe, on which I have already commented.

Another matter my delegation believes deserves a special comment is that of verification. I have already alluded to it in connexion with the efforts to reach a comprehensive test ban, in mentioning the work of the Ad Hoc Group of Seismic Experts. But I should like to tackle the problem in a broader context. It will not be possible to control the arms race and adopt measures to initiate a disarmament process without confidence - confidence in the reciprocal good faith of all the States concerned - and confidence presupposes the acceptance of measures of verification. The agreement reached by the SALT participants not to interfere with their "national means of verification" was a very important step forward. But this does not suffice and it is necessary to set up means of international verification, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, in the field of peaceful nuclear activities. My country feels, therefore, that the suggestion to establish an international satellite monitoring agency should be explored with faith and tenacity. May our desire to increase security through gradual disarmament surmount the financial and political obstacles that surround this proposal.

My delegation is aware of the many other aspects of the question of disarmament, in particular the urgency to conclude a chemical weapons ban treaty, as well as a treaty prohibiting all radiological weapons; the need to strengthen the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States, through adequate assurances; the perils inherent in nuclear horizontal proliferation but, at the same time, the right of every State to have access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes; the importance of nuclear-weapon-free zones and of zones of peace; the advantage of a regional approach in the question of the transfer of conventional weapons; the imperative of a treaty prohibiting or restricting the use of conventional weapons deemed to be excessively

(Mr. Rebelo de Andrade, Portugal)

injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. I do not feel, however, that at the present stage my delegation can add any further useful word to those which have already been said on these subjects.

I shall confine myself, therefore, to problems that my delegation considers as being fundamental. But as we think that it will not be possible to make important breakthroughs on disarmament without further progress on the path of détente, I should still like to stress the importance we attach to confidence-building measures, both those being practised in Europe in keeping with the agreement reached at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the new measures suggested for the same purpose. We sincerely hope that the studies undertaken or to be undertaken by the United Nations in this connexion will give rise to important practical measures.

(Mr. Rebelo de Andrade, Portugal)

I should also like to mention a special aspect of the unstable situation prevailing in the world today. I refer to the grave economic and social problems of the underdeveloped countries, problems that are a source of tensions and divisions among nations that cannot but contribute to that instability. It is my Government's considered view that the resources devoted to their development and the measures aimed at creating a more just and equitable international economic order are one of the most important factors on which détente depends.

Genuine progress on the road to disarmament can only result from the combination of two factors: détente, on the one hand, and awareness of the dangers presented to us by the current level of arms, on the other. We must believe that a continuing discussion of these problems within the United Nations and within ever-broader sectors of public opinion will produce the results necessary for the survival of humanity. This conviction must constitute a permanent stimulus to our work.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to ask representatives who may wish to speak on draft resolutions as of tomorrow, 6 November, to inscribe their names on the speakers' list.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.